

QA. 5/1/82 8/20/82 8T

Facility Name: CPS CHEMICAL/MADISON INDUSTRIES  
Location: OLD WATERWORKS RD. OLD BRIDGE TWP. NJ.  
EPA Region: II  
Person(s) in Charge of the Facility: WM. HONACHEFSKY (DEP)  
ANTHONY FARRO (DEP)

Name of Reviewer: EDWARD PUTNAM Date: 8/7/82

General Description of the Facility:

(For example: landfill, surface impoundment, pile, container;  
types of hazardous substances; location of the facility;  
contamination route of major concern; types of information  
needed for rating; agency action, etc.)

TWO MANUFACTURING FACILITIES WHICH HAVE  
BEEN SUBJECTED TO REPEATED SPILLS DUMPS  
AND DISCHARGES SINCE 1967. MASSIVE SOIL AND  
WATER CONTAMINATION OF RUNYON WELL FIELDS. SOURCE FOR  
COURT DECISION RENDERED. PID AIR SAMPLING  
NEGATIVE

POTABLE WATER  
PERMIT AM  
80

Scores:  $S_M = 69.73$  ( $S_{GW} = 88.46$   $S_{SW} = 82.03$   $S_a = 0$ )  
 $S_{FE} = 0$   
 $S_{DC} = 25.00$

. Figure 1

HRS COVER SHEET



# GROUND WATER ROUTE WORK SHEET

Rating Factor	Assigned Value (Circle One)	Multi-plier	Score	Max. Score	Ref. (Section)
<b>1</b> Observed Release	0 <b>(45)</b>	1	<b>45</b>	45	3.1
If observed release is given a score of 45, proceed to line <b>4</b> . If observed release is given a score of 0, proceed to line <b>2</b> .					
<b>2</b> Route Characteristics					3.2
Depth to Aquifer of Concern	0 1 2 3	2		6	
Net Precipitation	0 1 2 3	1		3	
Permeability of the Unsaturated Zone	0 1 2 3	1		3	
Physical State	0 1 2 3	1		3	
Total Route Characteristics Score				15	
<b>3</b> Containment	0 1 2 3	1		3	3.3
<b>4</b> Waste Characteristics					3.4
Toxicity/Persistence	0 3 6 9 12 15 <b>(18)</b>	1	<b>18</b>	18	
Hazardous Waste Quantity	0 1 2 3 4 <b>(5)</b> 6 7 8	1	<b>5</b>	8	
Total Waste Characteristics Score			<b>23</b>	26	
<b>5</b> Targets					3.5
Ground Water Use	0 1 2 <b>(3)</b>	3	<b>9</b>	9	
Distance to Nearest Well/Population Served	0 4 6 8 10 12 16 18 20 24 30 32 35 <b>(40)</b>	1	<b>40</b>	40	
Total Targets Score			<b>49</b>	49	
<b>6</b> If line <b>1</b> is 45, multiply <b>1</b> x <b>4</b> x <b>5</b> If line <b>1</b> is 0, multiply <b>2</b> x <b>3</b> x <b>4</b> x <b>5</b>			<b>50,715</b>	<b>57,330</b>	
<b>7</b> Divide line <b>6</b> by 57,330 and multiply by 100      Sgw = <b>88.46</b>					

# SURFACE WATER ROUTE WORK SHEET

Rating Factor	Assigned Value (Circle One)	Multi-plier	Score	Max. Score	Ref. (Section)
<b>1</b> Observed Release	0 <b>(45)</b>	1	<b>45</b>	45	4.1
If observed release is given a value of 45, proceed to line <b>4</b> . If observed release is given a value of 0, proceed to line <b>2</b> .					
<b>2</b> Route Characteristics					4.2
Facility Slope and Intervening Terrain	0 1 2 3	1		3	
1-yr. 24-hr. Rainfall	0 1 2 3	1		3	
Distance to Nearest Surface Water	0 1 2 3	2		6	
Physical State	0 1 2 3	1		3	
Total Route Characteristics Score			/	15	
<b>3</b> Containment	0 1 2 3	1	/	3	4.3
<b>4</b> Waste Characteristics					4.4
Toxicity/Persistence	0 3 6 9 12 15 <b>(18)</b>	1	<b>18</b>	18	
Hazardous Waste Quantity	0 1 2 3 4 <b>(5)</b> 6 7 8	1	<b>5</b>	8	
Total Waste Characteristics Score			<b>23</b>	26	
<b>5</b> Targets					4.5
Surface Water Use	0 1 2 <b>(3)</b>	3	<b>9</b>	9	
Distance to a Sensitive Environment	0 <b>(1)</b> 2 3	2	<b>2</b>	6	
Population Served/Distance to Water Intake Downstream	0 4 6 8 10 12 16 18 20 24 30 32 35 <b>(40)</b>	1	<b>40</b>	40	
Total Targets Score			<b>51</b>	56	
<b>6</b> If line <b>1</b> is 45, multiply <b>1</b> x <b>4</b> x <b>5</b> If line <b>1</b> is 0, multiply <b>2</b> x <b>3</b> x <b>4</b> x <b>5</b>		<b>52,785</b>		64,350	
<b>7</b> Divide line <b>6</b> by 64,350 and multiply by 100 $S_{sw} =$ <b>82.03</b>					

# AIR ROUTE WORK SHEET

Rating Factor	Assigned Value (Circle One)	Multi-plier	Score	Max. Score	Ref. (Section)
<b>1</b> Observed Release	<u>0</u> 45	1		45	5.1
Date and Location: <u>8/6/82 ON SITE</u>					
Sampling Protocol: <u>PID GROSS ORGANIC VAPORS - NEGATIVE</u>					
If line <b>1</b> is 0, the S = 0. Enter on line <b>5</b> . If line <b>1</b> is 45, then proceed to line <b>2</b> .					
<b>2</b> Waste Characteristics					5.2
Reactivity and Incompatibility	0 1 2 3	1		3	
Toxicity	0 1 2 3	3		9	
Hazardous Waste Quantity	0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8	1		8	
Total Waste Characteristics Score				20	
<b>3</b> Targets					5.3
Population Within 4-Mile Radius	0 9 12 15 18 21 24 27 30	1		30	
Distance to Sensitive Environment	0 1 2 3	2		6	
Land Use	0 1 2 3	1		3	
Total Targets Score				39	
<b>4</b> Multiply <b>1</b> x <b>2</b> x <b>3</b>				35,100	
<b>5</b> Divide line <b>4</b> by 35,100 and multiply by 100 $S_2 =$ <u>0</u>					

	s	s <sup>2</sup>
Groundwater Route Score (S <sub>gw</sub> )	88.46	7825.49
Surface Water Route Score (S <sub>sw</sub> )	82.03	6728.92
Air Route Score (S <sub>a</sub> )	0	0
$S_{gw}^2 + S_{sw}^2 + S_a^2$		14554.03
$\sqrt{S_{gw}^2 + S_{sw}^2 + S_a^2}$		120.64
$\sqrt{S_{gw}^2 + S_{sw}^2 + S_a^2} / 1.73$		S <sub>M</sub> = 69.73

WORKSHEET FOR COMPUTING S<sub>M</sub>

NO CERTIFICATION

FIRE AND EXPLOSION WORK SHEET						
Rating Factor	Assigned Value (Circle One)		Multi- plier	Score	Max. Score	Rel. (Section)
<b>1</b> Containment	1	3	1		3	7.1
<b>2</b> Waste Characteristics						7.2
Direct Evidence	0	3	1		3	
Ignitability	0	1 2 3	1		3	
Reactivity	0	1 2 3	1		3	
Incompatibility	0	1 2 3	1		3	
Hazardous Waste Quantity	0	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8	1		8	
Total Waste Characteristics Score					20	
<b>3</b> Targets						7.3
Distance to Nearest Population	0	1 2 3 4 5	1		5	
Distance to Nearest Building	0	1 2 3	1		3	
Distance to Sensitive Environment	0	1 2 3	1		3	
Land Use	0	1 2 3	1		3	
Population Within 2-Mile Radius	0	1 2 3 4 5	1		5	
Buildings Within 2-Mile Radius	0	1 2 3 4 5	1		5	
Total Targets Score					24	
<b>4</b> Multiply <b>1</b> x <b>2</b> x <b>3</b>					1,440	
<b>5</b> Divide line <b>5</b> by 1,440 and multiply by 100 SFE = 0						

# DIRECT CONTACT WORK SHEET

Rating Factor	Assigned Value (Circle One)	Multi-plier	Score	Max. Score	Ref. (Section)
<b>1</b> Observed Incident	<u>0</u> 45	1		45	8.1

If line **1** is 45, proceed to line **4**  
 If line **1** is 0, proceed to line **2**

<b>2</b> Accessibility	0 1 2 <u>3</u>	1	<u>3</u>	3	8.2
------------------------	----------------	---	----------	---	-----

<b>3</b> Containment	0 <u>15</u>	1	<u>15</u>	15	8.3
----------------------	-------------	---	-----------	----	-----

<b>4</b> Waste Characteristics Toxicity	0 1 2 <u>3</u>	5	<u>15</u>	15	8.4
--	----------------	---	-----------	----	-----

<b>5</b> Targets					8.5
Population Within a 1-Mile Radius	0 1 <u>2</u> 3 4 5	4	<u>8</u>	20	
Distance to a Critical Habitat	<u>0</u> 1 2 3	4	<u>0</u>	12	

Total Targets Score	<u>8</u>	32
---------------------	----------	----

<b>6</b> If line <b>1</b> is 45, multiply <b>1</b> x <b>4</b> x <b>5</b> If line <b>1</b> is 0, multiply <b>2</b> x <b>3</b> x <b>4</b> x <b>5</b>	<u>5,400</u>	21,600
---	--------------	--------

<b>7</b> Divide line <b>6</b> by 21,600 and multiply by 100	Soc = <u>25</u>
---	-----------------

8/10/82

CONVERSATION  
 W/TOM MISERAK  
 MIDDLESEX CO.  
 HEALTH DEPT.  
 740 PEOPLE  
 HOMES AND  
 EMPLOYEES

Byron Sullivan

FROM Gene Keller

DATE 8/8/79

SUBJECT Chemical discharge from CPS Chemical Co.

Date of Inspection: August 3, 1979

Persons Interviewed: Jack Rowe - CPS Chemical  
Ms. Kozlakowski - Complainant  
Mrs. Perenci - Complainant

Observations:

Late Friday morning, August 3, 1979, Carl Ochs arrived in the office with various plants which had been burned and a lamp shade which had a brownish-black greasy substance deposited on it. Carl stated that the complainants had felt the substance had come from International Silver, which is located in the vicinity of their homes. He felt that the substance probably did not originate from International Silver, but more likely it originated from either CPS Chemical or Madison Industries.

I then coincidentally received a call from Ray Olsen of International Silver to report that he was having electrical problems on the fuel supply to the after burner on one of his incinerator systems. I asked Mr. Olsen if he had a malfunction or explosion in any of his incinerators on Wednesday night or if any of his employees recall hearing an explosion at the time. Mr. Olsen stated that he had not had any incidents at that time but he would inquire to see if any of his employees had heard an explosion.

After speaking with Mr. Olsen I called Jack Rowe at CPS Chemical. Mr. Rowe stated that they had an accidental discharge at approximately 10:30 p.m. on Wednesday, August 1, 1979. This occurred through a rupture disc located on a reaction vessel. This vessel was in the last step in a distillation process, and should have been operating at atmospheric pressure. Mr. Rowe stated that the cause of the discharge was either that the vent to atmosphere was plugged and too much pressure developed which caused the rupture disc to vent or a exothermic reaction had developed and pressure was created too fast for the atmospheric vent to relieve the pressure and the rupture disc blew in order to relieve the sudden pressure. Mr. Rowe said that at this time they were investigating the incident in order to prevent any future discharges and that when they finished their investigation he would send a copy of the report to this inspector.

The chemicals in solution were, according to Mr. Rowe, a 50:50 methanol and water solution, which made up approximately 90% of the material in the reaction vessel, the remaining 10% was made up of dimethyl adipate which is the dimethyl ester of adipic acid. (See Merck Index page 22-#151 for uses.)

I then discussed the accumulation of the substance on the homes



in the nearby area. I informed Mr. Rowe that as a result of the discharge there was some crop damage to the gardens at the above referenced homes, also that there had been cars at the homes which had their paint damaged. Mr. Rowe stated that some of his employees vehicles had the paint pit because of the discharge and that the company's insurance was covering that damage. Mr. Rowe then stated that the insurance company would most likely take care of the damages.

Mr. Rowe and I then proceeded to attempt to trace the direction of the mist which was discharged. We traced it in a direction which would eventually lead to the complainants homes on Bordentown Avenue. We were unable to trace the damage directly to the homes due to the dense foliage in the area. There were traces of some recent damage to the trees in this area, as the leaves were burnt, with occasional green sections on these leaves.

Mr. Rowe and I then returned to the office and Mr. Rowe stated that I should contact the complainants and inform them that either CPS's insurance company would take care of the damages or the company itself would, if necessary. Mr. Rowe stated that the complainants should contact himself or Mr. Jesse Zazik who is the company controller and they will arrange for the insurance people to stop by and arrange for the settlement of the damages.

On Wednesday, August 8, 1979, this writer contacted Ms. Kozlakowski, daughter of the complainant. I told Ms. Kozlakowski of the arrangement with CPS Chemicals and that if they felt they needed this writer present at the meeting to contact me and I would attempt to be present. Ms. Kozlakowski inquired as to the edibility of the vegetables which had been in contact with the aforementioned chemicals. I told Ms. Kozlakowski that I was not completely qualified to answer that question but I had found that this chemical is used as a food additive. I also added that if this episode had occurred in my garden I would probably not eat the vegetables myself.

I also spoke with Mrs. Ferenci and told her of my results with the company. I also told Mrs. Ferenci that if she had any questions or if she desired my presence at the meeting with the company, to call me and I would attempt to be present.

#### Conclusions:

From speaking with Mr. Rowe it was determined that CPS Chemicals had an accidental discharge which was most likely the cause of the substance which was deposited on the Ferenci's and Kozlakowski's property. CPS Chemicals is willing to take the steps necessary to rectify any damages caused by the discharge.

#### Recommendations:

Follow up to verify that steps have been taken by CPS Chemicals to remedy any impositions caused by the emissions from the ruptured disc.



Eugene A. Keller  
Sr. Environmental Specialist

16246



State of New Jersey  
DEPARTMENT OF ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION  
DIVISION OF ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY  
JOHN FITCH PLAZA, P. O. BOX 2807, TRENTON, N. J. 08625

ORDER

To: Madison Industries, Inc.  
Frank E. Halloway, Registered Agent  
Old Water Works Road  
P. O. Box 175  
Old Bridge, New Jersey 08857


Re: N.J.A.C. 7:27-2.3(a)  
Plant Identification No. 15153  
Violation Occured on Premises  
Known As:  
Old Water Works Road, Lot 11, Block  
6303, East Brunswick Township,  
Middlesex County, New Jersey

WHEREAS, the State Department of Environmental Protection has determined by investigation(s) or inspection(s) made pursuant to the Provisions of the New Jersey Air Pollution Control Act that on May 22, 1979 you did violate Title 7, Chapter 27, Subchapter 2, Section 2.3(a), of the New Jersey Administrative Code.

The investigation(s) discloses open burning of refuse including zinc powder on the premises identified above.

NOW, THEREFORE, YOU ARE HEREBY ORDERED, to cease violation of said Subchapter on the premises owned, leased, operated or maintained by you on or before July 24, 1979.

Dated: July 9, 1979

  
Edward J. Londres  
Assistant Chief  
Bureau of Air Pollution Control

cc. Local District  
Field Office

East Brunswick Township  
Central

CERTIFIED MAIL

VAP001  
Jul. 78

FIELD OFFICE - COMPLIMENT FILE

**General Action Log:**

[illegible]

**M E M O R A N D U M**

State New Jersey  
Department of Environmental Protection

**TO:** Subchapter 5.1 file

**FROM:** Anthony McMahon  
Vince Krisak

**DATE:** November 22, 1977

**SUBJECT:** Madison Industries - Old Water Works Rd., Old Bridge

**Date of Inspection:** November 18, 1977

**Persons Interviewed:** Mr. Sisco - Vice President of CPS Chemical  
Mr. Rowe - Supervisor of CPS Chemical  
Mr. Hy Bzura - Consultant of Madison Industries

**Observations:**

On the evening of November 17, 1977 and morning of November 18, 1977, calls were received on the Hot Line from Mr. Ciszek, night shift supervisor of CPS Chemical, reporting an acid odor and particulate fumigation which was causing CPS night shift employees to complain and threaten to stop working.

Mr. Krisak and I arrived at CPS Chemical at about 10:30 a.m. on November 18, 1977. Mr. Ciszek had left for the day but we met with Messrs. Sisco and Rowe. They stated that during the night and until 9:00 a.m., strong acid odors and a heavy concentration of particulate had been detected in their production area. They stated that numerous complaints from night shift employees had been received and several employees had threatened to stop work if condition did not improve. Mr. Rowe stated the source of the particulate was the tall stack adjacent to the new building at Madison Industries (later identified as the scrubber exhaust for the calcine operation Permit and Certificate #31879). He reported the acid odor source closer to the plant entrance.

Mr. Rowe went on to say that CPS Chemists have taken air samples on previous dates when odor and dust conditions existed and results indicate substantial concentrations of hydrochloric acid and heavy metals including zinc, lead and cadmium. Mr. Rowe was told that his tests would not be accepted as evidence in future legal action. Mr. Rowe reported that his intention was not to point the finger at anyone but was concerned for the health of his employees. Affidavits were left with Mr. Rowe who stated that the night employees would complete. Mr. Rowe also agreed to write a cover letter including a statement by the company regarding the incident.

Mr. Rowe escorted us to the areas where dust and odor had earlier been detected. A mild acid odor was detected about midway between Old Water Works Road and the stream crossing the property of both plants. Mr. Rowe stated that the odor was the same as the one his employees had been complaining about, although much less strong. Further back, across the stream, Mr. Rowe pointed out particulate accumulations which he attributed to the new scrubber on Madison Industries calcine operation.

At approximately 11:20 a.m., we attempted to make an inspection at Madison Industries. We asked to see Mr. Mazur, Environmental Engineer, but were told that the company paging system was out of order and someone would be sent for him. After waiting for almost 30 minutes, we asked to see Mr. Holloway or Mr. Bzura. We were told that Mr. Holloway was on vacation.

Shortly, Mr. Bzura appeared. We informed him of the complaints and the odor we had detected and asked to make a plant inspection to identify the odor source. He requested we come back after lunch, that he could not drop everything to take us through the plant. He was told that we felt an inspection was warranted immediately while the odor was occurring. Mr. Bzura became abrasive and stated that an inspection would not be made today. Mr. Bzura was warned that a violation was suspected and that obstructing our inspection of a suspected violation would be considered a violation of N.J. Air Pollution Control Act (1954).

At that point Mr. Bzura ordered two unnamed employees to escort us along the easterly border of the plant but not to enter the process areas. He ordered the employees (one of them actively smoking a cigar) to check for odor with us, but if they smelled odor they were to kiss our a---s.

We proceeded along the property line towards the stream. At approximately midway between the stream and Old Water Works Road we detected an acid type odor. The employees reported no odor.

We returned to the office and informed Mr. Bzura of our findings and again requested a plant inspection. Mr. Bzura demanded at least 24 hours notice before a plant inspection. Again we informed Mr. Bzura that obstructing our inspection would be a violation. He reported that he didn't care what we did and that we were to get off his property immediately.

At about 2:20 p.m. we drove past Madison Industries and observed a steam plume emanating from the calcine scrubber stack.

A violation of N.J.A.C. 26:2C-9.1 was cited.

A violation of N.J.A.C. 7:27-8.3(b) was also cited for operating the calcine scrubber without an approved certificate.

#### Conclusion:

Odor complaints were verified but source could not be identified due to company obstructing inspection. Violations were written.

#### Recommendations:

Process violations.

  
Vince Krisak

Environmental Specialist  
VK:AJM:df

  
Anthony McMahon

Sr. Environmental Technician

CENTRAL JEFFERSON REGIONAL AIR POLLUTION CONTROL AGENCY  
Investigation Summary

OUT-OF-AREA *Madison Industries*

SOURCE Possibly: Madison Industries

LOCATION Waterworks Rd. Old Bridge  
No. Street Municipality

MAILING ADDRESS \_\_\_\_\_

PERSON(S) INTERVIEWED \_\_\_\_\_ Title \_\_\_\_\_

PREMISES ENTERED / TIME IN \_\_\_\_\_ a.m. p.m. OUT \_\_\_\_\_ a.m. p.m.  
N.C.A. V.N.# SPECIFIC \_\_\_\_\_

COMPLAINT # 756-77

DATE 8-26-77 TIME 9:13 a.m. p.m.

CHAPTER REF. \_\_\_\_\_

SINGLE ☐ MULTIPLE ☒

CLIMATIC CONDITION:

☒ Clear ☐ Cloudy ☐ Fog  
☐ Rain ☐ Snow

WIND: Vel. 5-7 mph TEMP. 72°

Dir. S-SW

OBSERVATIONS

I detected a sweet chemical type odor at Mr. Hedges' house, (approx #2). I tracked this odor all the way back to Waterworks Rd. in Old Bridge (SEE MAP). The odor was described as a large stack which was emitting an opacity plume, approx. 5 miles long. The odor could also be a combination of a few different odors but it had an acrylate odor to it. I couldn't enter C.P.S. Co. of Madison Industries since neither was within our jurisdiction. I believe the majority of the odor was coming from the opacity plume, which belonged to M.P.O. Industries.

The next morning (while on early patrol) 8:00 a.m. I returned to M.P.O. Industries and took a picture of the stack which was still emitting an opacity plume; there was also a very mild odor.

These complaints were referred to:

8-26-77: Old Bridge Health Dept - 10:30 pm & D.F.P. on-site Sec. 10:40 pm

8-27-77 - D.F.P. 9:30 pm, George Weiss.

RECOMMENDATIONS \_\_\_\_\_

INVESTIGATED BY: R. B. Smith  
signed

Superior  
title

ASSISTED BY: \_\_\_\_\_  
signed

title

PROCESSED FOR FURTHER ACTION At

Refer to D.P. Super.

N.C.A. + Geo. Weiss 8-30-77  
Specific from or to Date

APPROVED BY

[Signature]

SOURCE <u>Madison Industries / I.S. Company</u>		COMPLAINT # <u>844-77</u>
LOCATION <u>Water Works Rd</u>	<u>Old Bridge</u>	DATE <u>9-15-77</u> TIME <u>9:30</u> <sup>a.m.</sup> <sub>p.m.</sub>
Street	Municipality	CHAPTER REF. <u>6.1</u>
MAILING ADDRESS _____		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> SINGLE <input type="checkbox"/> MULTIPLE
PERSON(S) INTERVIEWED _____		CLIMATIC CONDITION:
Title _____		<input type="checkbox"/> Clear <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Cloudy <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Fog
Title _____		<input type="checkbox"/> Rain <input type="checkbox"/> Snow
<input type="checkbox"/> PREMISES ENTERED / TIME IN _____ a.m. p.m. OUT _____ a.m. p.m.		WIND: Vel. <u>0 to 3</u> TEMP. <u>68°</u>
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> N.C.A. <input type="checkbox"/> V.N.# _____ SPECIFIC <u>Out of Area</u>		Dir. <u>SW to E</u>

OBSERVATIONS

I arrived in the area at 9:45pm and detected a light chemical odor. The complainant verified the odor. I drove around the area and found the odor to be coming from Old Bridge. The odor at the complainant's was a combined odor from I.S. Company, and Madison Ind. Both plant had heavy emissions of smoke and opacity. As the wind shifted the odor dispersed from the complainant's.

RECOMENDATIONS N.C.A. - Refused to Complain  
Referred to George <sup>UEIS</sup> at Time of C. # 845

INVESTIGATED BY: <u>[Signature]</u> signed	<u>[Signature]</u> title	PROCESSED FOR FURTHER ACTION <u>At</u> <u>Copy to DSP</u> Specific <u>Ref. P.m.</u>	APPROVED BY: <u>[Signature]</u> Super. <u>9-17-77</u> Date
ASSISTED BY: _____ signed	_____ title		

9/19/77

C.J.R.A.P.C.A.  
COMPLAINT FORM

NAME: MRS. Baily  
ADDRESS: 24 Adam Blvd.  
SAYREVILLE  
TELEPHONE NO. 721-5795

COMPLAINT # 844-77  
DATE: 9-15-77 TIME: 9:30 <sup>AM</sup><sub>P.M.</sub>  
MUNICIPALITY: SAYREVILLE <sup>MADISON IND.</sup>  
SOURCE: Out-of-Area I.S. Company

NATURE OF COMPLAINT: Bad odor around the AREA

ASSIGNED TO: Rozub INSPECTED: DATE: 9-15-77 TIME: 9:45 <sup>AM</sup><sub>P.M.</sub>

FINDINGS/ACTION TAKEN: Light odors found from I.S. Co. and  
Madison Industries REFERRED to George Weiss  
Central over Phone by R. Blakely 8:50 AM 9-16-77

COMPLAINANT NOTIFIED BY: ☒ Visit ☒ Phone ☐ Letter/Date & Time: 9-15-77



STATE OF NEW JERSEY  
DEPARTMENT OF ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION  
BUREAU OF AIR POLLUTION CONTROL

REPORT OF FIELD INVESTIGATION

DATE 4/12/76 TIME \_\_\_\_\_ FILE # \_\_\_\_\_  
REFERENCE TO CHAPTER 5.1

FULL BUSINESS NAME MADISON Industries

Location Old Water Wks. Rd. MADISON Twp.  
No. Street Municipality

Mailing Address \_\_\_\_\_  
No. Street Post Office Zip Code

Person(s) Interviewed MRS. Hendricks Complainant  
Frank Holloway PH. mgr.  
Title Title

Comments \_\_\_\_\_

Report Requested by Private Cit. Program Title

Purpose of Investigation chapt. 5.1 Complaint investigation

Observations Mr. Harry Hendricks complained about Acid Fumes  
being emitted by Madison Industries. Source was  
not verified until 4/7/76. At this time Madison  
Industries was found in violation of 7.27-8.3 (B)  
For operating equip. formally covered under Cto's  
15854-55.

Conclusions Sub 8.1 violation. No <sup>Acid</sup> Fumes verified off  
MADISON Industries Property.

Recommendations Do not initiate 5.1; complainant does not live  
in the area of MADISON Industries.

Investigated by Conde Verheem Signed  
Sh. Enr. Sp. Title

DEPARTMENT OF ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION  
BUREAU OF AIR POLLUTION CONTROL

## REPORT OF FIELD INVESTIGATION

DATE Sept 26 1974 TIME \_\_\_\_\_ FILE # \_\_\_\_\_  
REFERENCE TO CHAPTER 6FULL BUSINESS NAME FOOD ADDITIVESLOCATION OLD WATER WORKS Rd MADISON TWP  
No. Street MunicipalityMAILING ADDRESS \_\_\_\_\_  
No. Street Post Office Zip CodePERSON(S) INTERVIEWED FRANK HOLLOWAY PLT MGR  
Title

Title

REMARKS \_\_\_\_\_

REPORT REQUESTED BY ENFORCEMENT SECTIONPURPOSE OF INVESTIGATION COMPLAINT INVESTIGATION RELATIVE  
OFFENSIVE ODORS OCCURRING DURING THE EVENING  
OF SEPT. 25<sup>TH</sup> + THE MORNING OF SEPT 26<sup>TH</sup>OBSERVATIONS ON THE MORNING OF SEPT 26<sup>TH</sup> 1974 I WAS  
REFERRED A COMPLAINT ISSUED BY THE CENTRAL  
NEW JERSEY AIR POLLUTION COMM. CONCERNING ODOR  
COMPLAINTS EMANATING FROM FOOD ADDITIVES, INC.  
DURING INVESTIGATION I SPOKE WITH MRS KOZLAKOWSKI  
AND MRS RITA FERENCI, BOTH OF BORDENTOWN AVE, OLD  
RIDGE. SEE ATTACHED AFFIDAVITS.CONCLUSIONS BOTH COMPLAINTS CONFIRMED NEARBY ODORS OF  
1 ROTTEN EGG SMELL BETWEEN 8:10AM - 10:00AM 9-26-74.  
M. FRANK HOLLOWAY (FOOD ADDITIVES) DENIED ANY ODORS  
AT THIS TIME. SEE CNP 9 VIOLATION + REPORTRECOMMENDATIONS REFER TO ATTORNEY GENERAL'S  
OFFICE

Investigated by

Joseph DePuccio  
Signed  
Si Emun Spec  
Title